

TS-EAS Annual Meeting
Austin, Tx., August 1, 2019
9:00 am – 3:00 pm

Present: Huffman, Custer, Bredenberg, Gardner, Snyder, Nimer, Smith, Jagodzinski, Wittwer (Liaison from standards), Arnold, Turner; Duryee, online: Johnson, van Dongen, Purkis (Early career member);

Present: Pitti, Combs

- I. Welcome and Introductions (9-9:15)
Welcome to all new and old!
TS EAS will have an early career member 2019-2020, Jessica Purkis.
- II. Report from the Co-Chairs (9:15-9:30) (Major/minor revisions, funding request denied, volunteer, etc.)

Major versus minor revision work by Standards Committee (SC);

We have provided input from EAD and EAC-CPF. SC will provide guidance to the subcommittees. Really about what we do and what DACS do. Draft definitions are minor changes do not affect the application or interpretation of the standard and would not result in the user's current application of the standard being non-compliant. Major changes that change the application or interpretation of the standard so much as to make previously compliant use of the standard suddenly non-compliant.

Question around the addition of an optional element is that major or minor?

SC is trying to keep it a little bit broad; trying to encompass both DACS and EAS standards, with eye towards publication and education efforts. Complete within the next year.

Funding request

The funding request for the EAC-CPF revision was denied. Suggestion to apply again.

Volunteer

We have Clara Snyder being a volunteer aiding us with the on-line participation today.

- III. Team Reports: Q& A

The team reports are available at: <https://github.com/SAA-SDT/TS-EAS-subteam-notes/tree/master/TS-EAS-Notes/SAA19>

EAD web report from Glenn:

Fifty countries! A lot more than just Europe and North America. Question about page views for EAD3 and the comparison to EAD 2002? Glenn informs that it might be possible to go back and look from years past using the old reports. The repost is in the GitHub folder for the meeting. After the meeting the same info was added for EAC-CPF.

Short recap of the team reports:

EAD

Implementation survey, proposed calendar for managing minor revisions; awkwardness of waiting for standards policy on minor revisions. Minor changes to the tag library based on the shared schema work. A few outstanding feature requests that would relate to changing the schema but haven't made decisions on that.

EAC-CPF

Middle of the revision; this revision is a major revision. Dec. 2018 released an updated schema (minor). The EAC-CPF team has a full day meeting 1st of August 2019. On the agenda: names, dates, identifiers, assertions. On the way to discussing the user requests. Preparing for Berlin meeting (3 days) discuss topics like relations, EAG, EAC-F, etc. including things from other standards and the big topic of the shared schema questions; working out how to do it in detail, goal is to have an idea after the Berlin meeting of a first draft of the revised schema, to have an idea of when it would be released for call for comments. and hopefully release revised EAC-CPF schema in early 2021.

Major/minor work by SC don't affect the work, proceed as you would; it's the minor things that are more troublesome; the major revisions already have procedures. What is written out for the major revision is probably not going to change.

Schema

Did not meet frequently this year; previous year was gearing up for 3.1.1; two biggest pieces were the minor revision of EAC-CPF; contact with Carl Wilson, Open Preservation Foundation, met with the entire group and gave us a GitHub overview and met again to help us think through how we are using GitHub for schema-related Git Hub repositories; happy to look for new members! Kerstin decides to join the group.

Ad hoc Shared schema

Not only submitted a report and included links to more detailed documentation; intensive half year; going through a comparison of EAD3 and EAC-CPF; looking specifically for the elements and attributes are shared in order to identify what might be areas to look at closer.

General results: encourage a certain harmonization between both standards (maintenance, training, application); harmonization can also be basically on the documentation level (minimum approach), making sure that the descriptions match in the tag libraries, examples are similar. Question to consider: Do we want to take the technical step to create a shared schema, which would be modular, easier to integrate EAC-F.

Documentation:

Way behind: updating documentation on the SAA site; get SAA staff to reconfigure the way that the microsite works for this committee; de-commissioned for TS-EAD and TS-EAC sites. Available through the internet archive, but otherwise inaccessible from the SAA site.

Translations: shared understanding of what we're offering; reached out to some in the room about the actual maintainer of the various translations. The policy on translations is essentially defined by: we are going to offer services, if people will make an offer to like to have a repository to maintain their translation, we are happy to make pdfs, etc. but we are not responsible for the maintenance of the translation, etc. We don't have the resources to

review translations and verify the accuracy; not endorsing it but hosting it on the repository. Setting roles and responsibilities: key contacts, persistent access if not in GitHub.

Someone stepping up or soliciting translations? Focus right now is mostly reaching out to those folks that are doing translations, but if we have a good workflow in terms of maintaining translations, before we reach out to who. Pitti, suggests an Arabic translations and that the statistics from the websites for EAD and EAC-CPF should drive the translations suggestions.

IV. Team Work

EAC-CPF Revision work

Middle of the major revision process of EAC-CPF; what we did so far we tackled issues and questions based on user feedback over the past 10 years.

The focus day yesterday was built upon four topics where we prepared papers, examples, proposal. For all four topics, we found a solution. We agreed on a solution (so to say) and we are going to refine that over the next weeks; we are going to upload a white paper in the GitHub repository for everyone to follow the discussion and decision and, take a look, give feedback.

Rights statements and declarations needs to be investigated together with EAD3 and the Shared Schema Team. The related standards report provides input. Florence Clavaud might have input in the investigation. The rights can also be dived and concern different parts like the metadata and or the digital objects referenced.

Pitti asked about assertion proposal and possible modification of sources?

Answer: Topic discussed yesterday in short, exercise and strengthen sources; URL citation and found data components to sources. Essence of what we felt was needed. We wouldn't want people to repeat the same source citation over and over again. Part of the fine tuning that needs to take place.

Shared Schema report and proposal

A recap of the team report was made.

What is the goal of a shared schema? Harmonizing the EAS standards, maintain, teach, adopt and implement. Seizing the opportunity to refactor and fix bugs that exist in one or both of the separate schemas. should we take that a step further? Reducing duplication of effort to update two or more schemas; would ideally enable implementors to reuse rather than duplicate code.

Suggestions from the team for the committee to bring forward:

- Develop a set of principles to guide schema design. Considering the divergent practice about element names; principle around that. Practical principles, things that aren't required by XML but would simplify things.
- Evaluate impact on maintenance of tag libraries.
- Investigate examples from XML community. (TEI and ODD)

- Investigate the impact on implementers regarding - what is the impact and what is the benefit of migrating to a new standard? (Added during the discussion)

It can be noted that EAD is starting to be seen only as an exchange format. Software vendors and implementations might by using EAD and EAC-CPF only as a communication format and not as the maintenance format have it easier to incorporate both standards in the systems. We need to have a better understanding of how EAD3 is being used. Is it for maintenance/storage or export/import functionality only?

When discussing the principals these parts should also be considered:

- Should we have an EAS namespace? Are there advantages to not having a shared namespace? Well, objectXMLWrap in EAD3 allow to add things that aren't a part of the own namespace. Namespace is complicated with the way XML processors work with them.
- The use of xlink?
- Use the same naming convention for elements and attributes in all schemas. Choices: camelCase, PascalCase, lowercase, snake_case; intermediate possibilities.
- Naming conventions: The naming convention of EAD is dominant; therefore use that to avoid resistance. Overall trend is to move away from the XML for storage and more of a communication format
- Corrective, coming up with arguments for why we do this; making a commitment to this strategy; EAD3 survey is dispiriting. Design principles, any changes to the standards will follow these design principles. Ticking off the things that this will improve upon.
-

Timeline:

1. EAC-CPF revision underway
2. Smaller revisions of EAD3 rolling? (or will this work lead to a major revision?)
3. Development of EAC-F following the revision of EAC-CPF (and news from other standards and conceptual/ data models).

We need to remember that this is bigger than just two standards it's an EAS Strategy. For other standards we will handle in the committee as well. The less dependent you can be on anything outside of this group, the better. Main issue is striving for conceptual purity, really think we should be sensitive to the practical issues associated with this. What is the mission of this group? If there are things that we could do in addition to striving for the conceptual aspects, doing outreach, as the EAD3 implementation survey revealed, there are things that this group can do to make practically moving towards having their systems hospital to these changes.

What is the mission and vision of this group? Standards maintenance/ development? Or do we aspire to more? Assisting implementation?

The group agreed upon: if we name things the same thing, then we would be committed to that being shared. And if we can't commit the sharing, then it shouldn't be named the same thing.

The group agreed upon: The work is moved to the Schema Team.

The group agreed upon: The goal of having a decision on the principles at the Feb.-Mar. meeting.

The group agreed upon: Having a description about this work to present to SC.

EAC-F Proposal

In the EAC-F proposal document there are 5 questions the group needs to answer. All material is in the document in the meeting folder.

Question 1:

- Examine the selected XML-schema.
- Investigate how the Shared Schema work influences the work.
- Make the work on cooperation with the EAC-CPF work, and ISDF.

Question 2:

- A person who takes part in both groups.

Question 3:

- Something for the principles to consider.
- Needs to be looked at also in EAD and EAC-CPF.

Question 4:

- Silke will ask EGAD if this group will be able to get a pre-look at the function part of RiC.
- Can we find some aid in the ISO standards regarding records management? Do we have a contact being in records management who can help with the work?

Question 5:

- There is a need of finding out if ICA has plans for update of ISDF.
- Description of functions for persons, still an open question.

The group agreed upon: The work will be made by TS EAS! A working group is needed to be created.

Community Outreach proposal

The group agreed upon: Saying yes to the proposal. The group will consist of Adrian and one more member.

A comment is to make sure that its possible to translate the outreach material to other languages.

V. GitHub report

- Make sure you have an account and that you are made a member of the team in GitHub!

- There will be restructuring done among the GitHub team members.
- There are more work going on regarding versioning and so on in Git.

VI. Handbook

See the handbook as a team charge readme. Its not ready yet, but the work is ongoing.
A comment is that its needed to see who the members have been in the group.

VII. Committee Self-study

This is moved to the October meeting.
Team leads prepare to talk about your team!

VIII. Changing of the Guard

Kathy leaves over the co-chairmanship to Mark!

2019-08-29

Notes by Kathy Wissner and Karin Bredenberg